

DOCKET NO: 230421US26YA

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT & TRADEMARK OFFICE

IN RE APPLICATION OF :  
ANDREJ S. MITROVIC : EXAMINER: SAXENA, AKASH  
SERIAL NO: 10/673,501 :  
FILED: SEPTEMBER 30, 2003 : GROUP ART UNIT: 2128  
FOR: SYSTEM AND METHOD FOR :  
USING FIRST-PRINCIPLES SIMULATION  
TO CHARACTERIZE A  
SEMICONDUCTOR MANUFACTURING  
PROCESS

SUPPLEMENTAL APPEAL BRIEF UNDER 37 CFR 41.37

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
ALEXANDRIA, VIRGINIA 22313

SIR:

This is an appeal of the final Office Action dated February 27, 2008. A Notice of Appeal was filed on June 17, 2008. This submission is filed in response to the Notice of Non-Compliant Appeal Brief mailed August, 29, 2008 to address issues in Section IV of the previously filed Appeal Brief..

## **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

I.	41.37(C)(1)(I) Real Party of Interest .....	1
II.	41.37(C)(1)(II) Related Appeals and Interferences.....	1
III.	41.37(C)(1)(III) Status of Claims.....	1
IV.	41.37(c)(1)(iv) Status of Amendments .....	1
V.	41.37(c)(1)(v) Summary of Claimed Subject Matter .....	2
VI.	41.37(C)(1)(VI) Grounds of Rejection for Review.....	9
VII.	41.37(C)(1)(VII) ARGUMENTS.....	9
A.	Regarding the 35 USC 112 1 <sup>st</sup> Paragraph Rejection of Claims 1-44 and 48-50 .....	9
B.	Regarding the 35 USC 103 Rejection of Claims 1-44 and 48 over <u>Sonderman et al</u> and <u>Jain et al</u> .....	16
C.	Regarding the 35 USC 103 Rejection of Claims 49 and 50 over <u>Sonderman et al</u> and <u>Jain et al</u> .....	26
D.	Regarding the Double Patenting Rejections .....	27
1.	The Double Patenting Rejection over the ‘583 Application .....	27
2.	The Double Patenting Rejection over the ‘138 Application .....	27
3.	The Double Patenting Rejection over the ‘507 Application .....	27
VII.	41.37(c)(1)(vii) Claims Appendix Of Claims Involved In Appeal .....	27
IX.	41.37(C)(1)(IX) Evidence Appendix .....	27
X.	41.37(c)(1)(x) Related Proceedings Appendix .....	28
XI.	Conclusion .....	28
	EVIDENCE APPENDIX.....	39
	RELATED PROCEEDINGS APPENDIX .....	100

**I. 41.37(C)(1)(I) Real Party of Interest**

The real party of interest in this appeal is the assignee Tokyo Electron Limited whose address is Akasaka Biz Tower, 3-1, Akasaka 5-chome, Minato-ku, Tokyo 107-6325, Japan.

**II. 41.37(C)(1)(II) Related Appeals and Interferences**

There are no related interferences. There are related appeals filed or to be filed in U.S. Serial Nos. 10/673,138; 10/673,467; 10/673,506; 10/673,507; and 10/673,583.

**III. 41.37(C)(1)(III) Status of Claims**

Claims 1-44 and 48-50 are pending and appealed. Claims 45-47 and 51 are canceled.

Claim 1 stands provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over Claim 1 copending Application No. 10/673,583; Claim 1 stands provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over Claim 1 of copending Application No. 10/673,138; Claim 1 stands provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over Claim 1 of copending application No. 10/673,507; Claims 1-51 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as based on a disclosure which is not enabling, Claims 1-51 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,802,045 issued to Sonderman et al., in view of IEEE article “Mathematic-physical engine: parallel processing for modeling and simulation of physical phenomena” by Jain et al.

**IV. 41.37(c)(1)(iv) Status of Amendments**

An amendment was filed for this application on November 29, 2007 which resulted in the final Office Action dated February 27, 2008. An amendment after the final rejection was

filed on May 27, 2008 canceling Claims 45-47 and 51. The amendment filed May 27, 2008 was entered for the purpose of appeal. A terminal disclaimer was also filed on May 27, 2008. The terminal disclaimer was approved June 2, 2008.

**V. 41.37(c)(1)(v) Summary of Claimed Subject Matter**

**Claim 1**, the first of the independent claims appealed, will be treated as a picture claim representing many of the features in the remaining independent claims. Accordingly, a claim chart for support is provided below showing support from the specification for the claim elements.

In short, Claim 1 defines a method of controlling a process performed by a semiconductor processing tool. The method inputs process data *relating to an actual process being performed* by the semiconductor processing tool, and inputs a first principles physical model including a set of computer-encoded differential equations. The first principles physical model describes at least one of a basic physical or chemical attribute of the semiconductor processing tool. The method performs first principles simulation *for the actual process being performed during performance of the actual process* using the physical model to provide a first principles simulation result in accordance with the process data relating to the actual process being performed in order to simulate the actual process being performed. The first principles simulation result is *produced in a time frame shorter in time than the actual process being performed*. The model uses the simulation result as part of a data set that characterizes the actual process being performed by the semiconductor processing tool.

Accordingly, Claim 1 makes clear that a first principles simulation result *for the actual process being performed during performance of the actual process* is used as part of a data set that characterizes the actual process being performed by the semiconductor

processing tool. The following is a claim chart comparison of the claim elements to the disclosure in the specification. Emphasis has been added for convenience in some of the longer passages from the specification.

<b>Claim 1</b>	<b>Support in U.S. Pat. Appl. No. 10/673,501</b>
A method of controlling a process performed by a semiconductor processing tool, comprising	<u>Specification, numbered paragraph [0011]</u> : One aspect of the present invention is a method of facilitating a process performed by a semiconductor processing tool, which includes inputting data relating to a process performed by the semiconductor processing tool, and inputting a first principles physical model relating to the semiconductor processing tool. First principles simulation is then performed using the input data and the physical model to provide a simulation result for the process performed by the semiconductor processing tool, and the simulation result is used as part of a data set that characterizes the process performed by the semiconductor processing tool.

<p>inputting process data relating to an actual process being performed by the semiconductor processing tool</p>	<p><u>Specification, numbered paragraph [0032]:</u> Data input device 104 is a device for collecting data relating to a process performed by the semiconductor processing tool 102 <b><i>and inputting the collected data to the first principles simulation processor 106.</i></b> . . . In one embodiment, the data input device 104 may be implemented as a physical sensor for collecting data about the semiconductor processing tool 102 itself, and/or the environment contained within a chamber of the tool. Such data may include fluid mechanic data such as gas velocities and pressures at various locations within the process chamber, electrical data such as voltage, current, and impedance at various locations within the electrical system of the process chamber, chemical data such as specie concentrations and reaction chemistries at various locations within the process chamber, thermal data such as gas temperature, surface temperature, and surface heat flux at various locations within the process chamber, plasma processing data (when plasma is utilized) such as a plasma density (obtained, for example, from a Langmuir probe), an ion energy (obtained, for example, from an ion energy spectrum analyzer), and mechanical data such as pressure, deflection, stress, and strain at various locations within the process chamber.</p> <p><u>Specification, numbered paragraph [0039]:</u> FIG. 2 is a flow chart showing a process for using first principles simulation techniques to-facilitate a process performed by a semiconductor processing tool in accordance with an embodiment of the present invention. The process shown in FIG. 2 may be run on the first principles simulation processor 104 of FIG. 1, for example. As seen in FIG. 2, the process begins in step 201 with the inputting of data related to a process performed by the semiconductor processing tool 102. As discussed above, the input data may be data relating to physical attributes of the tool/tool environment and/or data relating to a process performed by the tool on a semiconductor wafer or results of such process. As also described above, <b><i>the input data may be directly input from a physical sensor or metrology tool coupled to the first principles simulation processor 104,</i></b> or indirectly input from a manual input device or database.</p>
--	--

<p>inputting a first principles physical model including a set of computer-encoded differential equations, the first principles physical model describing at least one of a basic physical or chemical attribute of the semiconductor processing tool;</p>	<p><u>Specification, numbered paragraph [0035]:</u> First principles physical model 106 is a model of the physical attributes of the tool and tool environment as well <b><i>as the fundamental equations necessary to perform first principles simulation</i></b> and provide a simulation result for facilitating a process performed by the semiconductor processing tool. Thus, the first principles physical model 106 depends to some extent on the type of semiconductor processing tool 102 analyzed as well as the process performed in the tool. For example, the physical model 106 may include a spatially resolved model of the physical geometry of the tool 102, which is different, for example, for a chemical vapor deposition (CVD) chamber and a diffusion furnace. Similarly, the first principles equations necessary to compute flow fields are quite different than those necessary to compute temperature fields. The physical model 106 may be a model as implemented in commercially available software, such as ANSYS, of ANSYS Inc., Southpointe, 275 Technology Drive Canonsburg, Pa. 15317, FLUENT, of Fluent Inc., 10 Cavendish Conn. Centerra Park, Lebanon, N.H. 03766, or CFD-ACE+, of CFD Research Corp., 215 Wynn Dr., Huntsville, Ala. 35805, to compute flow fields, electromagnetic fields, temperature fields, chemistry, surface chemistry (i.e. etch surface chemistry or deposition surface chemistry). However, special purpose or custom models developed from first principles to resolve these and other details within the processing system may also be used.</p> <p><u>Specification, numbered paragraph [0036]:</u> First principles simulations in the present invention include, but are not limited to, simulations of electro-magnetic fields derived from <b><i>Maxwell's equations, continuum simulations, for example, for mass, momentum, and energy transport derived from continuity, the Navier-Stokes equation</i></b> and the First Law of Thermodynamics, as well as atomistic simulations derived from the Boltzmann equation, such as for example Monte Carlo simulations of rarefied gases (see Bird, G. A. 1994. Molecular gas dynamics and the direct simulation of gas flows, Clarendon Press).</p>
--	---

<p>performing first principles simulation for the actual process being performed during performance of the actual process using the physical model</p>	<p><u>Specification, numbered paragraph [0012]:</u> A first principles simulation processor is configured to input a first principles physical model relating to the semiconductor processing tool, and perform first principles simulation using the input data and the physical model to provide a first principles simulation result. The first principles simulation result is used as part of a data set that characterizes the process performed by the semiconductor processing tool.</p> <p><u>Specification, numbered paragraph [0036]:</u> First principles simulation processor 108 is a processing device that applies data input from the data input device 104 to the first principles physical model 108 to execute a first principles simulation. Specifically, the first principles simulation processor 108 may use the data provided by the data input device 104 to set initial conditions and/or boundary conditions for the first principles physical model 106, which is then executed by the simulation module.</p> <p><u>Specification, numbered paragraph [0057]:</u> In this embodiment, steady-state simulations are repeatedly run concurrently with the process by using the physical sensor measurements to repeatedly update boundary conditions of the first principles simulation model.</p>
<p>to provide a first principles simulation result in accordance with the process data relating to the actual process being performed in order to simulate the actual process being performed,</p>	<p><u>Specification, numbered paragraph [0036]:</u> The output of the first principles simulation processor 108 is a simulation result that is used to facilitate a process performed by the semiconductor processing tool 102. For example, the simulation result may be used to facilitate process development, process control and fault detection as well as to provide virtual sensor outputs that facilitate tool processes, as will be further described below.</p>



<p>said first principles simulation result being produced in a time frame shorter in time than the actual process being performed; and</p>	<p><u>Specification, numbered paragraph [0041]</u>: In step 205, the first principles simulation processor 108 uses the input data of step 201 and the first principles physical model of step 203 to execute a first principles simulation and provide a simulation result. Step 205 may be performed either concurrently with or not concurrently with the process performed by the semiconductor processing tool. For example, simulations that can be performed at short solution times may be run concurrently with a tool process, and results used to control the process. More computationally intensive simulations may be performed not concurrently with the tool process and the simulation result may be stored in a library for later retrieval. In one embodiment, step 205 includes using the input data of step 201 to set initial and/or boundary conditions for the physical model provided in step 205.</p> <p><u>Specification, numbered paragraph [0057]</u>: In this embodiment, steady-state simulations are repeatedly run concurrently with the process by using the physical sensor measurements to repeatedly update boundary conditions of the first principles simulation model.</p>
--	--

<p>using the simulation result as part of a data set that characterizes the actual process being performed by the semiconductor processing tool.</p>	<p><u>Specification, numbered paragraph [0012]:</u> The simulation result is used as part of a data set that characterizes the process performed by the semiconductor processing tool.</p> <p><u>Specification, numbered paragraph [0042]:</u> Once the simulation is executed, the simulation result is used to facilitate a process performed by the semiconductor processing tool 102. As used herein, the term "facilitate a process performed by the semiconductor processing tool" includes using the simulation result for example to detect a fault in the process, to control the process, to characterize the process for manufacturing runs, to provide virtual sensor readings relating to the process, or any other use of the simulation result in conjunction with facilitating a process performed by the semiconductor processing tool 102.</p> <p><u>Specification, numbered paragraph [0048]:</u> The present inventors have also discovered that the network architecture of FIG. 3 provides the ability to distribute model results done at one processing tool 102 for one condition set, to other similar or identical tools operating later under the same or similar conditions, so redundant simulations are eliminated. Running simulations only for unique processing conditions at on-tool and standalone modules and re-using results from similar tools that have already known simulated solutions allows for rapid development of lookup libraries containing results that can be used for diagnostics and control over a large range of processing conditions. Further, the reuse of the known solutions as initial conditions for first principles simulation reduces the computational requirements and facilitates the production of simulated solutions in a time frame consistent with on-line control. Similarly, the network architecture of FIG. 3 also provides the ability to propagate changes and refinements made to physical models and model input parameters from one simulation module to others in the network. <i>For example, if during process runs and parallel executions of a model it is determined that some input parameters need to be changed, then these changes can be propagated to all other simulation modules and tools via the network.</i></p>
--	---

**Claim 23** defines a system which is similar to the method of Claim 1. Thus, the

features of Claim 23 are supported in the specification by numbered paragraphs [0011], [0012], [0032]. [0035], [0036], [0039], [0041], [0042], [0048], and [0057].

**Claim 48** defines at least one of non-volatile media and volatile media containing program instructions for execution on a processor, which is similar to method Claim 1. Thus, the features of Claim 48 are supported in the specification by numbered paragraphs [0011], [0012], [0032]. [0035], [0036], [0039], [0041], [0042], [0048], and [0057].

#### **VI. 41.37(C)(1)(VI) Grounds of Rejection for Review**

Whether the rejection of Claim 1 under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting over Claim 1 of U.S. Pat. Appl. No. 10/673,583 (the '583 application) should be reversed. Whether the rejection of Claim 1 under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting over Claim 1 of U.S. Pat. Appl. No. 10/673,138 (the '138 application) should be reversed. Whether the rejection of Claim under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting over Claim 1 of U.S. Pat. Appl. No. 10/673,507 (the '507 application) should be reversed. Whether the rejection of Claims 1-44 and 48-50 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as being based on a non-enabling disclosure should be reversed. Whether the rejection of Claims 1-44 and 48-50 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sonderman et al in view of Jain et al should be reversed.

#### **VII. 41.37(C)(1)(VII) ARGUMENTS**

##### **A. Regarding the 35 USC 112 1<sup>st</sup> Paragraph Rejection of Claims 1-44 and 48-50**

Briefly recapitulating, Claim 1 defines a method of controlling a process performed by a semiconductor processing tool, including:

- 1) inputting process data relating to an actual process being performed by the semiconductor processing tool,
- 2) inputting a first principles physical model including a set of computer-encoded differential equations, the first principles physical model describing at least one of a basic physical or chemical attribute of the semiconductor processing tool,
- 3) performing first principles simulation for the actual process being performed **during performance of the actual process** using the physical model to provide a first principles simulation result in accordance with the process data relating to the actual process being performed in order to simulate the actual process being performed, **said first principles simulation result being produced in a time frame shorter in time than the actual process being performed**, and
- 4) using the simulation result as part of a data set that characterizes the actual process being performed by the semiconductor processing tool..

The claim defines clearly a process where data input from an actual process being performed is used for producing a first principles simulation result, produced for the actual process being performed during performance of the actual process. The result obtained is produced in a time frame shorter in time than the actual process being performed. The result obtained is then used as part of a data set that characterizes the actual process being performed by the semiconductor processing tool. M.P.E.P. 2164.01 states that the test of enablement is whether one reasonably skilled in the art could make or use the invention from the disclosures in the patent coupled with information known in the art **without undue experimentation**.

Appellant submits that details of 1) inputting the process data and 2) inputting the first principles physical model including what basic physical and chemical attribute of the semiconductor processing tool are used are disclosed in Appellant's filed specification. For instance, details of inputting data are given for example at numbered paragraphs [0032] and [0033], which state:

Data input device 104 is a device for collecting data relating to a process performed by the semiconductor processing tool 102 and inputting the collected data to the first principles simulation processor 106. The process performed by the semiconductor process tool 102 may be a characterization process (i.e. process design or development), a cleaning process, a production process, or any other process performed by the semiconductor processing tool. In one embodiment, the data input device 104 may be implemented as a physical sensor for collecting data about the semiconductor processing tool 102 itself, and/or the environment contained within a chamber of the tool. Such data may include fluid mechanic data such as gas velocities and pressures at various locations within the process chamber, electrical data such as voltage, current, and impedance at various locations within the electrical system of the process chamber, chemical data such as specie concentrations and reaction chemistries at various locations within the process chamber, thermal data such as gas temperature, surface temperature, and surface heat flux at various locations within the process chamber, plasma processing data (when plasma is utilized) such as a plasma density (obtained, for example, from a Langmuir probe), an ion energy (obtained, for example, from an ion energy spectrum analyzer), and mechanical data such as pressure, deflection, stress, and strain at various locations within the process chamber.

In addition to the tool and tool environment data, the data input device 104 may collect data relating to the process itself, or process results obtained on a semiconductor wafer that the tool 102 is performing a process on. In one embodiment, data input device 104 is implemented as a metrology tool coupled to the semiconductor processing tool 102. The metrology tool may be configured to measure process performance parameters such as: etch rate, deposition rate, etch selectivity (ratio of the rate at which a first material is etched to the rate at which a second material is etched), an etch critical dimension (e.g. length or width of feature), an etch feature anisotropy (e.g. etch feature sidewall profile), a film property (e.g. film stress, porosity, etc.), a mask (e.g. photoresist) film thickness, a mask (e.g. photoresist) pattern critical dimension, or any other parameter of a process performed by the semiconductor processing tool 102.

Details of inputting a first principles physical model for performing the first principles simulation result are given for example at numbered paragraphs [0035] and [0036] which state that:

First principles physical model 106 is a model of the physical attributes of the tool and tool environment as well as the fundamental equations necessary to perform first principles simulation and provide a simulation result for facilitating a process performed by the semiconductor processing tool. Thus, the first principles physical model 106 depends to some extent on the type of semiconductor processing tool 102 analyzed as well as the process performed in the tool. For example, the physical model 106 may include a spatially resolved model of the physical geometry of the tool 102, which is

different, for example, for a chemical vapor deposition (CVD) chamber and a diffusion furnace. Similarly, the first principles equations necessary to compute flow fields are quite different than those necessary to compute temperature fields. The physical model 106 may be a model as implemented in commercially available software, such as ANSYS, of ANSYS Inc., Southpointe, 275 Technology Drive Canonsburg, PA 15317, FLUENT, of Fluent Inc., 10 Cavendish Ct. Centerra Park, Lebanon, NH 03766, or CFD-ACE+, of CFD Research Corp., 215 Wynn Dr., Huntsville, AL 35805, to compute flow fields, electro-magnetic fields, temperature fields, chemistry, surface chemistry (i.e. etch surface chemistry or deposition surface chemistry). However, special purpose or custom models developed from first principles to resolve these and other details within the processing system may also be used.


First principles simulation processor 108 is a processing device that applies data input from the data input device 104 to the first principles physical model 108 to execute a first principles simulation. Specifically, the first principles simulation processor 108 may use the data provided by the data input device 104 to set initial conditions and/or boundary conditions for the first principles physical model 106, which is then executed by the simulation module. First principles simulations in the present invention include, but are not limited to, simulations of electro-magnetic fields derived from Maxwell's equations, continuum simulations, for example, for mass, momentum, and energy transport derived from continuity, the Navier-Stokes equation and the First Law of Thermodynamics, as well as atomistic simulations derived from the Boltzmann equation, such as for example Monte Carlo simulations of rarefied gases (see Bird, G.A. 1994. Molecular gas dynamics and the direct simulation of gas flows, Clarendon Press). First principles simulation processor 108 may be implemented as a processor or workstation physically integrated with the semiconductor processing tool 102, or as a general purpose computer system such as the computer system 1401 of Figure 14. The output of the first principles simulation processor 108 is a simulation result that is used to facilitate a process performed by the semiconductor processing tool 102. For example, the simulation result may be used to facilitate process development, process control and fault detection as well as to provide virtual sensor outputs that facilitate tool processes, as will be further described below.

Thus, one of ordinary skill in the art, from the detailed information provided in the specification as to the data input and as to the commercial availability of software programs, would **not** have to use undue experimentation to apply the respective physical attributes that each model is tailored to accept in order to perform the claimed inputting a first principles physical model step.

The examiner requested details of the models which lead to the unexpected result of being able to avoid the lengthy time conventionally required for the generation of a first principles model simulation. See page 10 of the Office Action. Appellant points out the procedures by which the unexpected results of the invention are achieved. It is not the details of the models, but rather the details as to how the model calculations are implemented which reduce the time for calculations. For instance, the disclosed characteristics in the specification which permit simulation results to be obtained in a time frame compatible with using the first principles model simulation result for real time process control are enumerated below with reference to the numbered paragraphs in the filed specification:

- 1) the use of interconnected resources inside a semiconductor device manufacturing facility to perform the first principles simulation (see specification, numbered paragraph [0043] and Figure 3, both reproduced below),
- 2) the use of code parallelization among interconnected computational resources inside the semiconductor device manufacturing facility (see specification, numbered paragraphs [0047] and [0048] reproduced below),
- 3) the sharing of simulation information among interconnected resources inside the semiconductor device manufacturing facility (see specification, numbered paragraphs [0047] and [0048] reproduced below), and
- 4) the reduction in redundant execution of substantially similar first principles simulations by different resources the reuse of known solutions as initial conditions for the first principles simulation, as features which used singularly or in combination lead to a simulation result in a time frame consistent with real time process control in a semiconductor processing tool (see specification, numbered paragraphs [0047] and [0048] reproduced below).

**Figure 3**



[0043] FIG. 3 is a block diagram of a network architecture that may be used to provide first principles simulation techniques to facilitate a process performed by a semiconductor processing tool in accordance with an embodiment of the present invention. As seen in this figure, the network architecture includes a device manufacturing fab connected to remote resources via the Internet 314. The device manufacturing fab includes a plurality of semiconductor processing tools 102 connected to respective simulation modules 302. As described with respect to FIG. 1, each semiconductor processing tool 102 is a tool for performing a process related to manufacturing a semiconductor device such as an integrated circuit. Each simulation module 302 is a computer, workstation, or other processing device capable of executing first principles simulation techniques to facilitate a process performed by a semiconductor processing tool 102. Thus, each simulation module 302 includes the first principles physical model 106 and the first principles simulation processor 108 described with respect to FIG. 1, as well as any other hardware and/or software that may be helpful for executing first principles simulations. Moreover, simulation modules 302 are configured to communicate with the fab-level advanced process control (APC) controller using any known network communication protocol. Each simulation module 302 may be implemented as a general purpose computer such as the computer system 1401 of FIG. 14.

[0047] The present inventors have discovered that the network configuration of FIG. 3 provides computational and storage resource sharing that allows a broad range of first principles simulation results at reasonable solution speeds, thus providing meaningful on-tool simulation capabilities that



can facilitate processes performed by the tool. Specifically, while simple simulations may be executed by a tool's dedicated simulation module, complex simulations requiring greater computational resources may be executed using code parallelization techniques on multiple simulation modules in the network that may be on-tool or standalone. Even on-tool simulation modules in equipment currently under preventive maintenance may be used as a shared computational resource, provided there is power to the simulation module. Similarly, simulation results used for later lookup can be stored in libraries (e.g. storage devices) anywhere in the fab network, and accessed by all tools when lookups of diagnostic or control data are made.

**[0048]** The present inventors have also discovered that the network architecture of FIG. 3 provides the ability to distribute model results done at one processing tool 102 for one condition set, to other similar or identical tools operating later under the same or similar conditions, so redundant simulations are eliminated. Running simulations only for unique processing conditions at on-tool and standalone modules and re-using results from similar tools that have already known simulated solutions allows for rapid development of lookup libraries containing results that can be used for diagnostics and control over a large range of processing conditions. Further, the reuse of the known solutions as initial conditions for first principles simulation reduces the computational requirements and facilitates the production of simulated solutions in a time frame consistent with on-line control. Similarly, the network architecture of FIG. 3 also provides the ability to propagate changes and refinements made to physical models and model input parameters from one simulation module to others in the network. For example, if during process runs and parallel executions of a model it is determined that some input parameters need to be changed, then these changes can be propagated to all other simulation modules and tools via the network.

Hence, it is respectfully submitted that, in view of the disclosure of commercial software available for the different physical models disclosed in the specification and in view of the disclosure of procedures by which the time for producing a first principles model simulation result can be reduced, the invention does not require undue experimentation.

Accordingly, the 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, rejection of Claims 1-44 and 48-50 should be reversed.

**B. Regarding the 35 USC 103 Rejection of Claims 1-44 and 48 over  
Sonderman et al and Jain et al**

The Office Action makes clear on pages 3 and 4 that the Examiner and the Appellant disagree as to whether the subscripts in Sonderman et al  $S_i$  associated with the silicon wafer disclosure refers to process control for the same wafer being processed or process control for subsequent wafers. The Examiner's position is that Sonderman et al would have used  $S_{i+1}$  to designate subsequent wafers.

Yet, Appellant respectfully points out that, at col. 9, lines 46-51, Sonderman et al specifically states:

The system 100 *then* optimizes the simulation (described above) to find more optimal process target ( $T_i$ ) for each silicon wafer,  *$S_i$  to be processed*. These target values are then used to generate *new control inputs*,  $X_{Ti}$ , on the line 805 to control *a subsequent process of a silicon wafer  $S_i$* . [Emphasis added]

The plain reading of this section of Sonderman et al is that the system 100 *then* (e.g., at time  $T_1$ ) optimizes the simulation for each silicon wafer,  *$S_i$  to be processed* (e.g., later at time  $T_2$ ). In other words, the simulation results of Sonderman et al produce a new control input for each silicon wafer *to be processed*. Thus, Appellant respectfully submits that Sonderman et al teach performing a simulation result for a process to be performed *before* performance of the actual process, and do **not** teach the claimed performing first principles simulation *for the actual process being performed during performance of the actual process*.<sup>1</sup>

Other sections of Sonderman et al support Appellant's position on this matter that the simulation results in Sonderman et al are made prior to controlling a subsequent process. For instance, Figure 4 of Sonderman et al (reproduced below) shows that the simulation results are produced *ahead of performing a process* and thus have to be based on historical data.

---

<sup>1</sup> Appellant also point out that Sonderman et al do not disclose or suggest a first principles simulation.




FIGURE 4

With reference to Figure 4, Sonderman et al disclose at col. 6, lines 24-47:

Turning now to FIG. 4, a flow chart representation of the methods in accordance with the present invention is illustrated. In one embodiment, *the system 100 defines a process task that is to be performed (block 410)*. The process task may be a photolithography process, an etching process, and the like. *The system 100 then performs a process simulation function (block 420)*. A more detailed description of the process simulation function described in block 420, is illustrated below. In one embodiment, a simulation data set results from the execution of the process simulation function.

*Once the system 100 performs the process simulation function, the system 100 performs an interfacing function*, which facilitates interfacing of the simulation data with the process control environment 180 (block 430). The process control environment 180 can utilize the simulation data in order to modify or define manufacturing control parameters that control the actual processing steps performed by the system 100. *Once the system 100 interfaces the simulation data with the process control environment 180, the system 100 then performs a manufacturing process* based upon the manufacturing parameters defined by the process control environment 180 (block 440). [Emphasis added]

Hence, the process flow in Sonderman et al is straightforward:

- 1) define a process to be modeled,
- 2) model the simulation result,
- 3) interface simulation result to processor, and then

4) run the process under control based on the pre-existing simulation result.

In the final Office Action, the examiner disagreed with this interpretation of Sonderman et al. On page 6 of the Office Action, the examiner pointed out a part of Sonderman et al.'s disclosure with emphasis added by underscoring which was believed by the examiner to support his position on this matter. This characterization is repeated below for the sake of convenience with the examiner's emphasis.

Furthermore, the simulation environment 210 can be used for feedback modification of control parameters invoked by the process control environment 180. For example, the manufacturing environment 170 can send metrology data results into the simulation environment 210. The simulation environment 210 can then use the metrology data results and perform various tests and calculations to provide more accurate, modified control parameters to the process control environment 180. A feedback loop is then completed when the process control environment 180 sends the modified or adjusted process control parameters to the manufacturing environment 170 for further processing of semiconductor wafers. {Examiner's emphasis added.}

Appellant respectfully points out that this description in Sonderman et al is a description of a **feedback loop** as Sonderman et al describe just below that portion which the examiner emphasized. Feedback modification is by definition the control of future wafers based on what has already occurred to a previous wafer. Hence, this section supports rather than refutes Appellant's position on this matter.

Accordingly, Appellant respectfully submits that Sonderman et al do not disclose and indeed ***teach away*** from the present invention where data input from an actual process being performed is used for producing a first principles simulation result, which is produced for the actual process being performed during performance of the actual process for control of the actual process.

The deficiencies in Sonderman et al are not overcome by Jain et al. The Office Action in rejecting the present claims supplements the teachings of Sonderman et al with the

teachings of Jain et al for their teaching of computer encoded differential equations in a mathematical physical engine (MPE) which can be applied to wafer processing. See Office Action, page 16. Jain et al describe at pages 372-373 that:

We **propose** a wafer scale implementation of the MPE. The starting point would be a dedicated processing cell, optimized specifically for the PDE arithmetic and data routing. Because of the relative simplicity of the cell, it is expected that extremely large arrays (8x8 to 32x32) **could be** successfully processed on a single piece of silicon using Wafer Scale Integration techniques. In fact, we have already laid the foundation for the development of such a processing cell. Our Universal Multiply-Subtract-Add [11] **could be** adapted for this first cell design. Similarly, our nonlinear coprocessor cell [12]-[14] **might be used** in conjunction with the UMSA to provide advanced mathematical functions. As suggested in Fig. 2, there would be **courtyards of processors**, each with two interconnection networks and two memory banks. 2-D, 3-D, and 4-D problems could then be mapped for parallel computations. Since inter-processor delays are very small (say a few ns), extremely high speeds could be achieved. This, together with the high degree of parallelism, would result also in high throughput. We **envision** 100 to 1000 processors (on one wafer) forming a wafer scale MPE. At a clock frequency of 50 MHz, a single wafer could achieve up to 20 GFLOPs performance. With our nonlinear coprocessor added, each instruction could equate to multiple floating point operations.

Furthermore, because of the extendible architecture, several wafers **could be** interconnected as shown in Fig. 5 to construct a "stacked" MPE wafer system (SMPE). Note that no vertical interconnects within the stack of wafers are expected. Tens to hundreds of GFLOPs performance in a volume the size of a desk-top computer [15] **could** thus be achieved. However, **these predictions** ignore the likely technical advances in the next five years; a tenfold further increase in performance **might be achievable**. [Emphasis Added]

Thus, as emphasized above, the proposed development work in Jain requires the development of **futuristic** computational equipment which one of ordinary skill in the art would be reluctant to implement or utilize for the rigorous standards needed in semiconductor manufacturing.

Appellant's position in this matter is corroborated by Tan et al, attached in the Evidence Appendix. Tan et al also teach the use on an existing process model for feedback or feed forward processing. In feedback control, by definition, the results of a process step are

provided to subsequent wafer. In feed forward control, the results of a prior process step are used to adjust a subsequent process being run of the wafer. Tan et al describe:

The illustrative APC Framework 200 includes a process model 202 that receives ***feed-forward and feed-back data*** and calculates a processing parameter. The illustrative portion of the APC Framework 200 includes two measurement devices, in particular a pre-process metrology machine 204 and a post-processing metrology machine 206. The pre-process metrology machine 204 performs a measurement on a material prior to processing in a processing machine 208 and sends the measurement, as feed-forward data, to the process model 202. The processing machine 208 sends processed material to the post-processing metrology machine 206 ***to measure post-process data which is sent to the process model 202 as feedback data.***

Referring to FIG. 4, a schematic block diagram shows material flow of a processing step 400 of a semiconductor manufacturing process from a process engineer perspective. An APC plan 402 retrieves a process model from the data store 306, then executes a parameter calculation algorithm 404. The APC plan 402 gives the calculated parameters to a machine 406 and directs the machine 406 to execute the process. The machine 406 issues a signal to the APC plan 402 ***when the process execution is complete.*** The APC plan 402 sends the calculated parameters to the data history store 310 of the historical database 312.

Referring to FIG. 5, a schematic block diagram shows material flow of a post-process measurement step 500 of a semiconductor manufacturing process from a process engineer perspective. An APC plan 502 sends a message to a machine 504 instructing the machine 504 to measure a post-processed material. The machine 504 sends measurement data to the APC plan 502. The APC plan 502 retrieves an old process model from the data store 306. The APC plan 502 executes a model update algorithm 506. The APC plan 502 ***stores an updated model in the data store 306 for usage in the processing step 400.*** The APC plan 502 sends new model data to the data history store 310 of the historical database 312. [Emphasis added.]

Thus, Tan et al use post-process data to update a model for a subsequent process step.

Appellant's position on these matters is also supported by Kee et al, of record in this application and attached in the Evidence Appendix. In the outstanding Office Action, the examiner indicated that he found no connection or legal basis for considering the teachings of Kee et al. Recently published guidelines for the Patent and Trademark Office, published in Federal Register Vol. 72, No. 195, on Wednesday October 10, 2007 entitled: "Examination

Guidelines for Determining Obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103 in View of the Supreme Court Decision in KSR International v. Teleflex Inc.," indicate that:

Office personnel should consider all rebuttal evidence that is timely presented by the Applicants when reevaluating any obviousness determination. Rebuttal evidence may include evidence of "secondary considerations," such as "commercial success, long felt but unsolved needs, [and] failure of others", and may also include evidence of unexpected results. Office personnel must articulate findings of fact that support the rationale relied upon in an obviousness rejection. As a result, Applicants are likely to submit evidence to rebut the fact finding made by Office personnel. For example, in the case of a claim to a combination, Applicants may submit evidence or argument to demonstrate that:

- (1) one of ordinary skill in the art could not have combined the claimed elements by known methods (e.g., *due to technological difficulties*);
- (2) the elements in combination do not merely perform the function that each element performs separately; or
- (3) the results of the claimed combination were *unexpected*.

Once the Applicant has presented rebuttal evidence, Office personnel should reconsider any initial obviousness determination in view of the entire record. All the rejections of record and proposed rejections and their bases should be reviewed to confirm the continued viability. The Office action should clearly communicate the Office's findings and conclusions, articulating how the conclusions are supported by the findings. [Emphasis Added.]

M.P.E.P. § 2143.01(II) indicates that all teachings in the prior art must be considered.

M.P.E.P. 2141.03 indicates that the examiner must ascertain what would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention. Hence, for all these legal considerations, Kee et al is presented as rebuttal evidence for the non-obviousness of the claims.

Specifically, the prior art Kee et al reference is evidence of the **technological difficulties** involved in producing a first principles model simulation result and, under the published guidelines, should be considered. The prior art Kee et al reference represents what one of ordinary skill in the art would have known and would have expected at the time of the invention and, under the M.P.E.P., should be considered.

Kee et al deal with the process control of a Rapid Thermal Processing (RTP) tool and do **not** use real time modeling. RTP tools are tools used in semiconductor manufacturing.

Kee et al in detail disclose that:

The modeling apparatus 101 of the instant invention may also be used to perform an inverse analysis to establish the boundary conditions or parameter values required to achieve a certain function of the thermal system. This allows the apparatus to be used to establish the appropriate process parameters and boundary conditions for the thermal system modeled. In accordance with the instant invention, the inverse analysis can be directly carried out by the modeling apparatus ***rather than using the conventional approach, which merely solves the direct problem repeatedly, in a lengthy and costly iterative process***, to determine appropriate input parameters to achieve a desired result. In other words, in accordance with the instant invention, ***once a particular thermal process is modeled for a particular set of control parameters***, the device may then be used to automatically obtain the necessary control parameters to achieve a desired result by providing the modeling apparatus with parameters corresponding to the desired result.

To carry out the inverse analysis, the modeling apparatus 101 includes an inverse parameter input section 104 also connected to input device 103. A user inputs into the modeling apparatus 101 parameters corresponding to desired results, e.g., desired temperature characteristics of the system, which are stored in memory 108. The processing unit 110, under control of modeling program 111, ***uses the previously generated model*** of the thermal system and the parameters held in memory 108 and derives or predicts particular control parameters to meet the constraints entered through the inverse parameter input section 104. This process is more fully described below in connection with the examples provided.<sup>2</sup> [Emphasis added.]

Hence, Kee et al explicitly disclose that a ***previously generated*** model of the thermal system is used to design and control the thermal system. Kee et al exemplify the difficulties of a “conventional approach” which solves spectral radiation transport equations through “a lengthy and costly iterative process.” These problems forced Kee et al to use ***pre-generated model results*** for a control process of a RTP process.

The examiner in the final Office Action did not apply but rather noted the IEEE 1990 paper by Su-shing Chen, “AEMPES: An expert system for in-situ diagnostics and process

---

<sup>2</sup> Kee et al, col. 4, lines 21-50.



monitoring,” hereinafter referred to as AEMPS, as evidence that the most recently added limitation (said first principles simulation result being produced in a time frame shorter in time than the actual process being performed) is known in the art. Yet, AEMPS describes the use of simulation in neural network environment used to “learn processes and the equipment model.” See page 120, section 4. AEMPS describes in section 4 that “a rule-based expert system provides human interfaces and high-level decision support.” Accordingly, AEMPS does **not** describe a first principles simulation result, but rather describes a neural network learning-based simulation. Accordingly, a system such as in AEMPS which learns a behavior and establishes rules based on the behavior would be used in a feedback control (see section 4 of AEMPS). Such a system would **not** 1) produce a first principles simulation result or 2) produce a first principles simulation result during the performance of the actual process to control the actual process performed by the semiconductor processing tool.

Moreover, AEMPS describes in section 2 (regarding manufacturing automation) that it is **not known** how to couple computer aided design, the integration of a manufacturing line, and its simulator together, and that it is **not known** how “to complete integration of manufacturing lines with their simulators.” Hence, like Jain et al, AEMPS describes a *futuristic* system under development. Even if for the sake of argument it were supposed that the AEMPS system was a first principles simulation result (which it is not), one of ordinary skill in the art would be reluctant to implement or utilize the AEMPS system for the rigorous standards needed in semiconductor manufacturing.

The examiner in the final Office Action also noted appellant’s disclosure at numbered paragraphs [0004] and [0005] in the specification as an apparent admission that the feature of a first principles simulation result being produced in a time frame shorter in time than the actual process being performed was a feature known in the art. Yet, the specification

describes this material as being background material and makes no indication that what the present inventors recognized and described in the background section was known to others or would in any other way qualify as 35 U.S.C. § 102 prior art.

More importantly, numbered paragraphs [0004] and [0005] indicate at most that the times for a large number of simulations *typically done in the tool design stage* are comparable to wafer or wafer cassette processing times. There is no statement here regarding how long the times would be for a process control simulation. Further, numbered paragraphs [0004] and [0005] indicate that, at the time of the invention, there were serious impediments which would mean that it would not be possible, prior to the invention, to produce a first principles simulation result in a time frame shorter in time than the actual process being performed.

[0004] These industry and manufacturing challenges have led to interest in more use of computer based modeling and simulation in the semiconductor manufacturing industry. Computer-based modeling and simulation are increasingly being used for prediction of tool performance during the semiconductor manufacturing tool design process. The use of modeling allows the reduction of both cost and time involved in the tool development cycle. Modeling in many disciplines, such as stress, thermal, magnetics, etc., has reached a level of maturity where it can be trusted to provide accurate answers to design questions. Moreover, computer power has been increasing rapidly along with the development of new solution algorithms, both of which resulted in reduction of time required to obtain a simulation result. ***Indeed, the present inventors have recognized that a large number of simulations typically done in the tool design stage can presently be run in times comparable to wafer or wafer cassette processing times.*** These trends have led to the suggestion that simulation capability typically used only for tool design can be implemented directly on the tool itself to aid in various processes performed by the tool. For example, the 2001 International Technology Roadmap for Semiconductors ***identifies issues impeding the development of on-tool integrated simulation capability*** as an enabling technology for manufacturing very small features in future semiconductor devices.

[0005] ***Indeed, the failure of industry to implement on-tool simulation to facilitate tool processes is primarily due to the need for computational resources capable of performing the simulations in a reasonable time.*** Specifically, the processor capabilities currently dedicated to semiconductor

manufacturing tools are typically limited to diagnostic and control functions, and therefore could only perform relatively simple simulations. Thus, the semiconductor manufacturing industry has perceived ***a need to provide powerful dedicated computers in order to realize meaningful on-tool simulation capabilities***. However, dedication of such a computer to the semiconductor processing tool results in wasted computational resources when the tool runs processes that use simple simulations, or no simulations at all. This inefficient use of an expensive computational resource has been ***a major impediment to implementation of simulation capabilities on semiconductor processing tools***. [Emphasis added.]

Hence, Tan et al, Jain et al, Kee et al, AEMPES, and the background section of the specification ***all*** discredit any suggestion that the examiner may have read from the disclosure of Sonderman et al for real-time simulation and control of an actual process being performed.

The Supreme Court in *KSR International Co. v. Teleflex Inc. et al.* 2007 U.S. LEXIS 4745 reinforced the role of *Graham* factors, teaching away and elements working together in an unexpected and fruitful manner in deciding obviousness. The Court stated that:

In *United States v. Adams*, 383 U. S. 39, 40 (1966), a companion case to *Graham*, the Court considered the obviousness of a wet battery that varied from prior designs in two ways: It contained water, rather than the acids conventionally employed in storage batteries; and its electrodes were magnesium and cuprous chloride, rather than zinc and silver chloride. The Court recognized that when a patent claims a structure already known in the prior art that is altered by the mere substitution of one element for another known in the field, the combination must do more than yield a predictable result. 383 U. S., at 50-51. It nevertheless rejected the Government's claim that Adams's battery was obvious. The Court relied upon the corollary principle that when the prior art ***teaches away*** from combining certain known elements, discovery of a successful means of combining them is more likely to be nonobvious. *Id.*, at 51-52. When Adams designed his battery, the prior art warned that risks were involved in using the types of electrodes he employed. The fact that the elements worked together in ***an unexpected and fruitful manner*** supported the conclusion that Adams's design was ***not obvious*** to those skilled in the art. [Emphasis added.]

In the present situation, the claimed elements worked together in ***an unexpected and fruitful manner*** as compared to the prior art. For example, since in Sonderman et al there are ***new control inputs*** for each subsequent wafer, one can not compensate for real time excursions from the existing model occurring while the wafer is being processed. In other

words, the historically lengthy time for generation of a first principles model simulation would mean that, in Sonderman et al, one is prevented from realizing a real time process control based on a first principles simulation during the actual process being performed. Meanwhile, the claimed processes and systems (by producing a first principles simulation result in a time frame shorter in time than the actual process being performed) permits accurate control of the process even if the system being controlled deviates from its historical behavior.

For all these reasons, Appellant submits that independent Claims 1, 23, and 48 patentably define over Sonderman et al and Jain et al and Tan et al.

Hence, the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of Claims 1-44 and 48 as being unpatentable over Sonderman et al in view of Jain et al should be reversed.

**C. Regarding the 35 USC 103 Rejection of Claims 49 and 50 over Sonderman et al and Jain et al**

Claim 49 defines that the performing a first principles simulation includes providing for the first principles simulation a reuse of known solutions as initial conditions for the first principles simulation. The Office Action notes that “Jain teaches use of Navier Stokes and other known simulation solutions” and cites pp. 367-368 of Jain et al. However, the Navier Stokes equation on page 367 of Jain et al is a fluid flow equation which needs boundary conditions and which need s to be solved in order to produce a solution. The Navier Stokes equation on page 367 of Jain et al does **not** represent a solution, much less the reuse of known solutions as initial conditions for the first principles simulation. Appellant’s inspection of the remainder of Jain et al finds no disclosure of the reuse of known solutions as initial conditions for the first principles simulation.

Hence, for this additional reason (besides their dependence from allowable claims),

the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of Claims 49 and 50 as being unpatentable over Sonderman et al in view of Jain et al should be reversed.

**D. Regarding the Double Patenting Rejections**

**1. The Double Patenting Rejection over the '583 Application**

The filed terminal disclaimer addressed this issue. Hence, Appellant has overcome the double patenting rejection.

**2. The Double Patenting Rejection over the '138 Application**

The filed terminal disclaimer addressed this issue. Hence, Appellant has overcome the double patenting rejection.

**3. The Double Patenting Rejection over the '507 Application**

The filed terminal disclaimer addressed this issue. Hence, Appellant has overcome the double patenting rejection.

**VII. 41.37(c)(1)(vii) Claims Appendix Of Claims Involved In Appeal**

Attached herewith is a Claims Appendix.

**IX. 41.37(C)(1)(IX) Evidence Appendix**

Included in the appendix is a copy of Tan et al (U.S. Pat. No. 6,263,255).

Included in the appendix is a copy of Kee et al (U.S. Pat. No. 5,583,780).

Included in the appendix is a copy of Su-shing Chen, "AEMPES: An expert system for in-situ diagnostics and process monitoring," referred to by the examiner, but not applied, in the Office Action of February 7, 2008.

**X. 41.37(c)(1)(x) Related Proceedings Appendix**


There are no related proceedings.

**XI. Conclusion**

Appellant request on the basis of the arguments presented above that the outstanding grounds for the rejection be reversed. Appellant submits that the application is in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,  
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Ronald A. Rudder, Ph. D.  
Registration No. 45,618  
Attorney of Record  
OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,  
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.  
1940 Duke Street  
Alexandria, Virginia 22314  
(703) 412- 7033(Direct Dial)  
(703) 413-2220 (Facsimile)  
RRUDDER@OBLON.COM

Customer Number

**22850**

Tel: (703) 413-3000  
Fax: (703) 413 -2220  
(OSMMN 06/04)

I:\ATTY\RAR\AMENDMENTS\230421US\SUPPLEMENTAL-APPEAL.DOC